|    | Case 3:07-cv-03652-PJH  | Document 52 | Filed 11/20/2007           | Page 1 of 3     |  |
|----|---|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|
|    |   |             |                            |                 |  |
|    |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 1  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 2  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 3  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 4  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 5  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 6  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 7  |   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |             |                            |                 |  |
| 9  | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 10 | GREATER NAPA FAIR H<br>CENTER, a California No                                      |             | Case No. C-07              | -3652 PJH       |  |
| 11 | Corporation, doing busing FAIR HOUSING NAPA VA                                      | ness as     | [PROPOSED] (<br>SCHEDULING | CASE MANAGEMENT |  |
| 12 | an individual entity only   | et al.,     | 3011 <u>2</u> 302(3        | ONDEN           |  |
| 13 | Plaintiffs,   | <b>\</b>    |                            |                 |  |
| 14 | vs.   | {           |                            |                 |  |
| 15 | HARVEST REDWOOD<br>RETIREMENT RESIDENCE   | SELLO       |                            |                 |  |
| 16 | doing business as Redw<br>Retirement Residence; e                                   | yood        |                            |                 |  |
| 17 | Defendants  | )           |                            |                 |  |
| 18 |   | ·           |                            |                 |  |
| 19 | The initial case management conference in this matter was held on October 25        |             |                            |                 |  |
| 20 | 2007. Liza Cristol-Deman appeared on behalf of all plaintiffs, and Stuart Seaborn   |             |                            |                 |  |
| 21 | appeared on behalf of class plaintiffs. Sarah D. Mott and Kurt Franklin appeared on |             |                            |                 |  |

appeared on behalf of class plaintiffs. Sarah D. Mott and Kurt Franklin appeared on behalf of all defendants.

The Court sets the following litigation dates and deadlines:

| EVENT                               | DATE/DEADLINE |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Cut off for Class Related Discovery | May 12, 2008  |
| Motion for Class Certification Due  | June 25, 2008 |
| Opposition to Class Certification   | July 16, 2008 |
| Reply to Class Certification        | July 23, 2008 |

| 1 |  |
|---|--|
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |

5

6 7

9 10

8

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

26 27

28

| Hearing of Class Certification | August 6, 2008    |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Amendments to Add Parties      | February 22, 2008 |
| Amendments to Pleadings        | 1                 |

A further case management conference will be scheduled following adjudication on the class certification motion, at which time the Court will set a trial date and pretrial deadlines.

The Court declines to formally bifurcate class based and non-class based discovery, but the parties shall focus on the discovery necessary to litigate the class certification motion first. The Court expects the parties to work cooperatively to resolve disputes that arise during the discovery process without the Court's intervention. If the parties are unable to resolve a discovery dispute despite good faith efforts, the moving party shall file the appropriate motion for relief, and the matter will be referred to a magistrate judge for adjudication.

The Court finds that General Order 56 is inapplicable in this case.

The parties have requested a referral to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth Laporte for an early settlement conference. The Court agrees that a referral to Magistrate Judge Laporte is appropriate. Attorneys for plaintiffs shall contact Magistrate Judge Laporte's chambers to make the necessary arrangements. The settlement conference shall take place within 120 days of the case management conference, or no later than February 22, 2008.

Counsel were provided with copies of the Court's pretrial instructions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November , 2007.

Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Plaintiffs' counsel's notes reflect that the Court imposed a deadline for amending the pleadings of 90 days before the close of fact discovery. Defendants' counsel recalls a deadline of 60 days before the close of class certification discovery. The parties ask that the Court fill in the appropriate date or deadline.

Case 3:07-cv-03652-PJH Document 52 Filed 11/20/2007

Page 3 of 3